

4 January 1977

MEMORANDUM FOR: Deputy Director for Intelligence  
Deputy Director for Operations  
Deputy Director for Science and Technology

FROM : John F. Blake  
Deputy Director for Administration

SUBJECT : MAG Report to the DDCI on "Personnel  
Management", dtd 7 December 1976

1. You will recall at the Executive Advisory Group Meeting of 21 December the DDCI asked the Comptroller to make available to EAG members a copy of the 7 December 1976 MAG report to the DDCI on "Personnel Management." At the same time, the DDCI asked for a reaction to the MAG paper from the Office of Personnel.


2. I am writing you on this matter to solicit your cooperation in assisting the Office of Personnel in preparing a position on the MAG report to the DDCI. I do this because it is my belief that the main thrust of the MAG paper does not bear on policies solely developed and implemented in the first instance by the Office of Personnel. In fact, the paper addresses itself primarily to significant Agency personnel policies, collectively devised and approved through the years by a succession of DCI's and Heads of Directorates.

3. The Office of Personnel has undertaken a preliminary but not conclusive analysis of the voluminous points raised by MAG. To aid you in developing your position, I have attached, without comment, the results of that review to this paper. In preparing your position, I would suggest you enlist an officer in your Directorate with a good working knowledge of the personnel policies and procedures of this Agency.

25X1

4. There are certain ideas or suggestions in the paper which may be worth further examination. Difficulty exists, however, in properly identifying those ideas because the authors appear to have challenged the basic Career Service personnel management system of the Agency by piecemeal attacks on elements of the system rather than presenting a reasoned critique in a coherent fashion and then stating what would be their remedial course of action. As a result, there appear to be inconsistencies in the MAG paper with respect to the roles to be played by the principal elements of the system that would result if their suggestions were followed.

Att



25X1

John F. Blake

25X1

Rewritten to change paragraphs 2, 3 and 4.

- 1 - DDA Subject w/att
- 1 - DDA Chrono w/o att
- 1 - D/Pers w/att
- 1 - JFB Chrono w/o att

DDA:JFBBlake:der (4 January 1977)

This preliminary review of the 7 December MAG paper is in two parts: (I) General Comments; (II) a few specific points of strong disagreement where MAG has made highly questionable and unsupported generalizations and followed them by "corrective" recommendations:

I. The MAG paper on Personnel Management provides the EAG an incentive to assess the personnel system that was installed when the Personnel Approaches Study Group, comprised of inter-Directorate representation, prepared a set of recommendations that were adopted in early 1974 by the Management Committee. (It is interesting to note that the MAG paper nowhere mentions PASG and the significant initiatives that flowed from that study; e.g., merger of Career Services, career counselling, handbooks, etc.) After the new system had been underway a year, the Office of Personnel surveyed the Career Services to collect their own assessment of how far implementation had gone. This was reported to the employees in a Bulletin. The next step in evaluation was to survey the employees as to how they perceived implementation; this was done in the summer of 1976. An Employee Notice on the results is being prepared for dissemination. Thus, the system has been installed and we are establishing means to collect feedback both from management and from the employees.

In response to the question, "Do you feel the Agency has made improvements in personnel management methods and operations in the past two years?", the responses were Yes - 41 percent, No - 21 percent, and Undecided - 35 percent.

We do have one important reference point and that is the standardization of a number of the questions with a Civil Service questionnaire used in a large number of other agencies. This gives us a basis for comparison with the rest of government. When this is done, the responses of Agency employees show a favorable pattern that indicates a comparatively healthy personnel system.

The concept of a separate Career Service Board for rotatees is a contradiction in terms. The Career Services are designed to provide a home base for their career employees when they rotate for development or interest. To be a ward of a Rotatee Service Board is to be a paraplegic. Even more incredible is the concept that this board would promote rotatees "over the objections of the parent service." The problem here is that the parent service knows its requirements and its CSGA capabilities to bring this person

CONFIDENTIAL

back aboard. The "Rotatee Board" would in three years be a depository for unplaceables. Incidentally, the Management Committee spent some hours on this subject in 1974 and reached the quite workable rule that when a rotatee reaches three years out, a decision must be made as to whether the individual returns to the parent service or is picked up by his/her present service of assignment.

II. A few comments by paragraph:

Paragraph 4. The immediate level supervisor: Everyone agrees - even OP - the supervisor is an important cog in the career management machine. But it doesn't stop there. The system is strengthened by the use of Boards and Panels, whose multiple inputs broaden the identification of potential future jobs and training opportunities and reduce the impact a biased supervisor may make. They can play, and should play, an important role in the assessment function.

Paragraph 5. See PASG on counselling and the published Personnel handbooks of the Career Services which resulted.

Paragraph 6. "The best way to develop flexibility is to rotate people into substantive jobs - where duties are dissimilar" - The Agency has diminishing human resources and non-diminishing responsibilities. We had some 150 inter-Directorate rotations in 1975 and 600-plus intra-Directorate.

Paragraph 9. There are more than [ ] GS-14's and above in the Agency. The current Agency problem is to review senior assignments, in the first instance up to [ ] key positions, and perhaps subsequently all [ ] supergrades at the EAG level. We will have to see whether EAG can afford the time.

25X1

25X1

Paragraph 11. The question of "bringing the PDP to life" is puzzling. The DDCI has on 20 December 1976 signed a memo to the Deputies concerning his analysis and expectations on the 1977 PDP.

Paragraph 12. The 20 October EAG addressed the subject of "separation" and the confusion apparent from the Attitudinal Survey on this. Decision was to prepare a clearer Regulation and that draft is currently with the Secretary, EAG. The Agency does separate employees in their first year. There are reassignments; the employee is told when a problem is identified. This whole procedure is essential to the CIA personnel management system.

Paragraph 14. The Agency has for the most part good supervisors. They are conscientious. Fitness Reports today are far more particular and honest than five years ago. This is at least in part a result of constantly rotating membership of the evaluation panels. Regarding the remark on awareness of the employee to see his/her personnel file - it was open policy in 1974 [ ] reviewed their files), in 1975 [ ] in 1976, despite a radical change, because of a move to Ames Building, in the system of making each file available [ ]. Employees spend from 30 to 90 or more minutes in such a review and Agency policy requires another employee to be present. The suggestion that the Fitness Report incorporate the ranking of the employee in comparative evaluation is potentially harmful to the interests of employees. It would incorporate the ranking in the permanent record, where it might influence future assessments of performance through a halo or tarnish effect. The evaluation ranking is not appropriate to an appraisal of an employee's performance.

Paragraph 15. The Agency tried for CSC ratings and was turned down. MAG's concept to try for "some of our employees" would be patently discriminatory.

Paragraph 16. Promotions are based on competitive evaluation. "Rapid promotion for the bulk of the professionals to about the GS-13 level and then a severe bottleneck." This is not evidence of non-selective promotion, but is the product of the many factors that affect relative speed of promotion. The proposed new Regulation on promotion reinforces the principle of selectivity.

Paragraphs 17, 18 and 19. Personnel management in the Agency attempts to be responsive to Executive and Congressional interest in improving intelligence analysis. We also try to relate pay to value of the individual to the service.

Paragraph 20. The directions from the White House, OMB, CSC and Congress are informative on the classification of positions.

Paragraph 21. The Director, NPIC, feels this situation is not out of control. As a general concept, it was decided by the Management Committee, despite OP recommendation, to stay with the even grades since it gave more frequent promotions.

Paragraph 23. In 1974 the Management Committee, on the recommendation of OP, set up the Special Achievement Award and the Exceptional Accomplishment Award. To date, 58 awards have been approved for a total of \$105,425. The DCI and DDCI recently participated in a ceremony where one employee was awarded \$7,000.

Paragraph 24. The 35% is taken from the OP Attitudinal Survey. Other pertinent statistics not mentioned: 34% think promotions are given fairly and 30% are on the fence; 62% understand the promotion system; 65% say the pay is fair; and from the APP -- 26% of the Agency is promoted annually. As noted in the beginning, the Agency response on fairness of promotions is slightly better than the Government-wide response. If there is a problem, it is Government-wide.

Paragraph 25. EEO: Discussed at 20 October EAG Meeting. New policy proceeding rather successfully.

Paragraph 26. EEO procedures are clear. Grievance procedures are set forth in each Career Service Handbook. This is typical of guidance available to employees. Perhaps the employee does not absorb procedures until they have need to employ them. Other examples: Attitudinal Survey shows 46% of employees are not aware of the Developmental Profile, 57% have not read profile applicable to his/her job, 49% don't know the criteria used to determine rankings. Yet all information on these is published in the Career Service Handbooks, and their existence has been touted and touted, by notice, by bulletin and in all core courses of OTR.

Paragraph 27. Re lengthy processing procedures -- in the early Fall of 1976, a new and momentarily successful system of Directorate and OP coordinators was instituted which is drastically reducing processing time.

Paragraph 29. We do.

Paragraph 30. Inequities were set forth in the OP paper which MAG is commenting on. Percentages of promotion versus percentages of population are higher. Trend is correct.

Paragraph 31. Supervisors are not as likely to elicit free comments as outside (OP) interviews.

Paragraph 32. The whole counselling concept as published in the handbooks and practiced by the career management officers is designed to help this.

Paragraph 38. The last sentence, "Failing any other change, we suggest that every OTR course could probably be shortened at least 25% and most could be shortened 50%," perhaps best sums up the underpinnings of the whole paper. The Attitudinal Survey, not infrequently quoted in the MAG paper, shows 88% have received Agency-sponsored training, 70% believe it has made them more

CONFIDENTIAL

Approved For Release 2005/07/26 : CIA-RDP82-00357R000200130013-6

effective, and 66% have adequately utilized any additional training they have acquired.

Paragraph 39. It happens to be our concern also when "personnel concerns are a source of considerable unhappiness," and in every appearance by OP careerists in training courses, in weekly and monthly career service meetings, in our discussions and meetings with members of other components, in our EOD briefings, at every opportunity we are trying to cut down on that 57% who have not read the "profile applicable to job."